

**PERKINS
SMITH
&
COHEN**

CONFIDENTIAL

433 0 4 2005

Perkins Smith & Cohen LLP
Attorneys at Law

Jonathan C. Guest, Esquire
(617) 854-4246 Direct
(617) 854-4040 Facsimile
jguest@pscboston.com

FAX COVER SHEET

Date: February 4, 2005 **Client Code:** 10845-146
To: Examiner S.A. JIANG **To:** _____
USPTO _____
Fax #: 571-273-8300 **Fax #:** _____
To: _____ **To:** _____
Fax #: _____ **Fax #:** _____
To: _____ **To:** _____
Fax #: _____ **Fax #:** _____
Subject: _____
From: Stephen J. Gaudet, Esq. **Direct Dial:** (617) 854-4237
Assistant: Renee P. Granito **Direct Dial:** (617) 854-4209
Pages: 2 including this cover sheet.

MESSAGE:

NOTICE: This fax transmission contains confidential information from a law office. The information is intended only for the use of the individual(s) or entity named on this transmission sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this faxed information is prohibited, and this entire transmission should be returned to this firm immediately. If you have received this fax in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the return of the original documents to us at no cost to you. Thank you for your help.

FAX_USPTO.doc

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:	R. Preston Mason	Examiner: Jiang, S.A.
Serial Number:	10/033,149	Art Group: 1617
Filed:	October 19, 2001	
Attorney Docket No.	12915- 03CIP	
For:	SYNERGISTIC EFFECTS OF AMLODIPINE AND ATORVASTATIN METABOLITE AS A BASIS FOR COMBINATION THERAPY	

Perkins, Smith & Cohen, LLP
One Beacon Street, 30th Floor
Boston, MA 02108-3106

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


RESPONSE A (CIP) - SUPPLEMENTAL

Sir:

We file this supplemental response to further clarify the issue regarding the Double Patenting rejection.

It should be noted that there is no commonality between Applicant's pending application and the cited pending applications (10/214,058 & 10/637,781), *i.e.*, there are no common inventors nor are there common assignees. This information should help advise the Examiner as to the issue of Double Patenting.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen J Gaudet, Ph.D., Esq.
Reg. No. 48,921

2/4/05